2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

20

VOIR DIRE - PARKER

- 45f, why did you document this graffiti as a gang Q. detective?
- It says, "Valentine Bloods." And it's on the same basketball court with the previous two graffiti pictures.
- And 45g, as a gang detective back in 2005, what made you 0. document this particular gang graffiti?
- "311" and "C-killer" is Crip killer.

MS. GREENE: Those are my questions with regard to this particular set of exhibits.

MR. POTOLSKY: Your Honor, as to Exhibits b and q, we have an additional objection other than what's previously been stated.

Now understanding what the detective is ready to talk about as to b and g, we believe under Rule 403 they should be excluded because the additional probative value is far outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice.

I'm going to ask the Court to keep in mind that none of the defendants in opening statement or throughout the trial or I expect in closing argument are going to be disputing that the Bloods is an organization. The probative value at some point reaches overkill and unfair prejudice.

In b, the "Mecca" is "Murder every Crip child alive." And in g it says "Crip killer."

Now there's plenty of other photographs, plenty of other graffiti that can establish the type of stuff the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

government wants to do. But to have these defendants confronted with graffiti that was written by unknown people when they were 11, 12 years old, and as far as I know unconnected with the Bloods as a group, is unfairly prejudicial for the violence that's contained in that graffiti.

So in addition to the other grounds, we would add a Rule 403 objection, specifically as to b and q.

Having said that, the limited taste of the testimony, it doesn't appear that those limited questions are really calling for hearsay answers. I mean, I think in candor ---

THE COURT: The only one that does would be where saying that "B Ford" stands for the Beatties Ford Bloods.

MR. POTOLSKY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: He can testify that there is a group called the Beatties Ford Bloods. But he can't say that "B Ford" means "Beatties Ford Bloods." That was the only one that I thought was an opinion about stating what a particular thing said. But the other — did the other — did q say "Crip killer" or was it a C with a mark through it that means "Crip killer"?

MR. SMITH: That was the point that I was just fixing to raise, Your Honor. The fact that you just asked that question and that he testified to explain that issue that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

22

you just asked the question about -

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. SMITH: -- was what I was fixing to raise was that that next step of him explaining and interpreting that, it goes across that line of what we have been talking about for the past five or ten minutes. It's, I mean, I agree. The fact it says "Valentine Bloods" that's self-explanatory. The fact that the other one has Blood in the middle star is self-explanatory. It's that second step, again, with what looks like either a 3 or —

THE COURT: One is a C and one's a 3.

MR. SMITH: Well -

THE COURT: Looks like it.

MR. SMITH: I mean, it's a backwards C, if anything, with a line through it. But again, that takes that second step of interpretation that we've been discussing that we find objectionable.

MR. CULLER: Your Honor, I want to add that - well, there is an opinion from the Fourth Circuit, United States versus Williams. And it actually speaks to Agent Parker testifying as a lay witness. And they find it's harmless error because they find there's plenty of evidence in the record to support the jury's conclusions as they pertain to that defendant.

By the way, one of the defendants was acquitted in

25

can't recall.

1 that case and that was upheld or, excuse me, she was convicted 2 and her conviction was reversed on appeal. I'm sorry -- but 3 the - I mean, they go into detail about, you know, Agent 4 Parker being used as a lay witness — 5 THE COURT: Give me the cite and I will look at it 6 when we break. 7 MR. CULLER: Yes, sir. 8 MR. WEIDNER: Your Honor, it's the Fourth Circuit 9 Court of Appeal, number 14:4866. And the section of that 10 opinion that deals with Detective Parker's testimony - and 11 that was a Bloods trial case. It begins at page -- at the 12 bottom of page 15. It runs for two or three pages. 13 THE COURT: I'll take a look at it. 14 I know the Court's going to look at it. MS. GREENE: 15 First of all it's an unpublished opinion. 16 MR. CULLER: It is. 17 MR. WEIDNER: It is an unpublished opinion. 18 MS. GREENE: But I just want to point that out. But 19 I believe the section that pertains to Detective Parker's 20 testimony, I know the Court is going to look at it, I don't 21 think that the Fourth Circuit found that it was error. I 22 think the Fourth Circuit said, "at most it would have been 23 harmless error." The Court can go back and look at it. I

THE COURT: What I'm saying is, some of the stuff is

factual.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. GREENE: Right.

THE COURT: This is a gang officer who is taking who is - who finds these things to be important for him to document. And that's - there's nothing wrong with that. And — but the problem can get there when opinions come up like a C backwards means "Crip killer." That is not going to -- you'll be able to get a witness -- one of the guys will get up here that will tell you what that means because they all know it.

MS. GREENE: The other thing, Your Honor, to the Court's point, he's a fact witness.

THE COURT: He is a fact witness and then you can go over opinion.

I'm going to read Williams and take a look at it. You guys take a look at it --

MS. GREENE: It also had to do with him interpreting code in jail calls is what that portion of the opinion is about, I believe, was. That in a Bloods trial they had Detective Parker talk about what he meant about certain drug codes were in wiretaps, I think. It didn't have to do with him explaining graffiti photographs that he had taken or anything like that.

THE COURT: Right, but it's explaining things.

MS. GREENE: It is.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: That's where the -- those that are in the middle of it, that live it, can tell what it means.

> MS. GREENE: Right.

THE COURT: But someone else who is not living it is in a position of being a fact witness maybe and maybe an expert witness.

Let me take a look at the opinion. And there's no point in, you know, I wanted to know whether -- if it's -- if something is, you know, been found - is error but harmless error. I don't want to commit any error. I mean, I'm going to commit error in every single trial I do, most of it harmless. Because I'm very, very careful about it. But nobody tries a perfect case. And the Court tries to avoid any error that it can.

So I will take a look at what that case says, and you all are going to have to object on these things. I'm not going to give you a blanket objection so that you all can pour through the transcript looking for error at a later date. Ιf you got samething to object, object.

MR. CULLER: Yes, sir. I was just going to say, I have the opinion cued up --

> I think David's got it for me right now. THE COURT:

MR. CULLER: Very well.

You give us a cite and we can pull it THE COURT: He usually pulls stuff up before you guys do. If you got

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

something we don't have, we'll get it.

MS. GREENE: Your Honor, I would also point out 701 lay witness testimony, as well, things that he has observed and perceived and testimony based upon his own perceptions, as well.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll take a look at it. Do you all have Williams there to look at, the case?

MS. GREENE: Your Honor, I don't have a copy of it in front of me. My recollection is that the section on Detective Parker's testimony is relatively short. That issue that the defendants objected to and my recollection is, it had to do, again, had to do with his interpreting code, coded words in telephone calls.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good.

MR. WEIDNER: Your Honor, I have a copy of the opinion on my computer but unfortunately, I don't know why, but I'm not able to get on WiFi in the Court. So I can't email it. But Ms. Greene is welcome to read it on my computer.

THE COURT: They're probably jamming you.

Mr. Davis, you go ahead and make another copy of that for Ms. Greene and Mr. Gast.

Let's go ahead and take a break.

Fifteen minutes or it could be longer, depends on how long it takes me to digest this material.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

(Recess from 10:17 until 10:38.)

THE COURT: Okay. In the Williams case, United States versus Williams, is one of the folks in this case. What happened was the interpretation of telephone calls by both the officer and the - and some of the defendants. The Court didn't find any problem with the gang folks saying what "feed the plate means" and all those things mean. None.

What the problem was that the officer's interpretation of what the call said which was found to be harmless in that all the other people said the same thing. It meant "kill the witness, kill the person." All that was allowed in, every bit of it, by the people that testified about it.

So that's what I'm going to do here. We're not going to have them -- the officer can testify what he took, what pictures he took and why - and as part of his being in the gang group that he's trying to investigate.

The Court's going to allow all of the pictures in. I've done the 403 balancing test and I find that in a case where the allegations are about murder and racketeering and robbery, that the probative value of these in terms of determining what this gang is involved in as part of their racketeering, outweighs any prejudicial effect as to what is said in these. I am not going to allow an interpretation of any of this.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For instance, he can — if you have — that it's something Blood or whatever, he can't testify what that means. You can ask him another question as to whether there's an organization in Charlotte that goes by such and such. Then the jury will have to interpret that.

MS. GREENE: I can or cannot ask him that? THE COURT: You can. You can ask him if there's an organization in Charlotte known as such and such. And then they can make the - they can decide whether that means that. If they want to spend hours arguing that it doesn't mean that, they can. They can do whatever they want to do about it. You can't testify that a C with a mark through it means "Crip killer."

MS. GREENE: Understood.

THE COURT: That will be whatever that shows. what I will allow him to do is testify about facts, what he collected. And then I've already heard testimony about some of these things. Some of these things I know what they mean because I've heard testimony about what they mean in the group.

He can look at Facebook pictures and say, "Did you see — any of your pictures have any of this in it? Yeah." Then you put that picture up. And then you can put the Facebook up. If one of them has something in it that matches up to this graffiti, it matches up to the graffiti.

But you have to have somebody else testify about what some of this stuff means. It was pretty clear. This one was all agreed in it. It was Agee, Wynn and Schroeder from the Middle District that ruled on this case and it is unpublished. It's not exactly what the defense says that it says. But it's the interpretation by the officer that was error. It's not — the members of the gang can tell the folks what it means. And these people will understand it. They'll either decide these folks are in the gang and in the conspiracy and did this or not. It's going to be up to the jury to make that call.

MS. GREENE: Very well, Your Honor, understood. And I just want to make sure that I am complying with how the Court wants Detective Parker's direct to go.

Could I direct questions to him — without him saying what anything means. But could I say — the Court just said kind of like comparing things. Could, for example, if he's reading, reviewing a Facebook post that say, that has, for example, the C crossed out in a Facebook post —

THE COURT: Um-hmm.

MS. GREENE: — could I, without him saying what he thinks it means, could he say that he has seen Bloods members cross out C's before. Or he has seen that in all his years of investigating Bloods without saying what it means.

THE COURT: Not unless - not unless he seen him do

it. If he has a Blood member doing this to a C. No, he's not going to say that in his investigation he's done that. This is pretty clear.

All the stuff is on the same basketball court. A lot of the stuff is put together. Valentine on the sign. Murder every, whatever. And then the C crossed out and "killa" is there. Somebody is going to say what that means other than him. And if they don't then that's too bad. You're not going to recoup expert testimony through lay testimony. But you will get lay testimony.

And any fact that this witness knows he can testify, and any member of this organization can say what those things mean inside the organization. They can, you know, they can cross—examine them as snitches all they want and the jury will decide whether they're telling the truth or not.

But it's going to be up to whatever — whatever the jury finds is the truth of this. And on this testimony, no.

What he can do is, if you got something like a C crossed out, you can point that out and you go right back to that picture and show him that picture.

MS. GREENE: Right.

THE COURT: And let them make the call.

MS. GREENE: Okay.

THE COURT: Cause they're probably not going to hear anything that that has anything to do with, well, that's about

the Lord or something like that. Because nothing is coming that's going to explain that other than what's there and there.

MS. GREENE: Okay.

THE COURT: But I'm not going to — no opinions.

That's where the Court got into that with this specific witness in this district, and that is interpretation by a lay person of — the people in the gang can say what it means. I mean, in this we already heard lots of stuff about what it means, "on the plate, he's food" and all that kind of stuff. Good Lord. Grow up.

And then they got a — let's see here. In talking about this says, "Barnett specifically identifies only one challenged statement that pertained to him: In Parker's testimony the term 'eat the plate,' when used in Barnette's phone call with inmates at the Bertie Correctional Center, meant to follow an order, in that case, 'kill Del Ray Jackson.' Several other witnesses testified 'eat the plate' meant to carry out an order and the gang members could be ordered to attack or kill an identified person. And additional statements on the phone made it clear that Jackson was supposed to be shot and killed."

So they did not find reversible error there. And it was fine for the members of the gang to say exactly what those terms meant.

24

25

So we're going to hear a lot of testimony, if they've got it from people, and they're going to be allowed to testify about what those things mean, but you're going to have to get it from somebody else beside him.

MS. GREENE: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: He can testify what he saw. He can compare what he saw. That's it.

MS. GREENE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. POTOLSKY: Judge, with regard to our specific objection under Rule 403 as to — I believe it's Exhibit b.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. POTOLSKY: That's the "Mecca."

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. POTOLSKY: Underneath "Mecca" someone else wrote "murder every Crip child alive." I believe that I stated this as the ground previously but I just wanted to be very clear if I had not.

If I understand correctly that was 2004 when the picture was taken. Mr. Hankins was about 11 years old and well before he's alleged to have joined the group. We don't know who wrote it, what the context was. We don't know who it is that took the "Mecca" and then in a different color and a different handwriting put in "murder every Crip child alive."

I've reviewed the case law on prejudice and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

probative value with graffiti. And when it is relevant to motive or any other fact in issue I think it comes in.

For example, were this a Blood/Crip case, certainly there would be some probative value to that. Something that was written before he's alleged to have been a member that he's never approved, adopted, had knowledge of, et cetera, of that nature is irrelevant.

In other words, there's no probative value. doesn't make any fact in issue in this case against Mr. Hankins more likely. What it does is suggest to the jury unfairly that he is a child killer. And for that reason we object under Rule 403.

THE COURT: It does not show that in any way. What it shows is that at that time that the Bloods terminology and use at that time in existence in Charlotte was there.

MR. POTOLSKY: Which we don't contest.

THE COURT: You'll be able to show that they have no evidence that at the time that was done he was a member of the Bloods.

If you want — at any time. I mean, you can point out that he was 11 at that time. We have one witness who was taken in at 11 by this organization. Must make mothers and grandmothers everywhere really happy their children are being brought in.

But the — but in this particular case they're

trying to establish an organization that is involved in a RICO and where it starts.

And the testimony that was allowed in this trial, in that Williams trial, goes all the way back to — some we already heard — to New York in 1993 and all that was found to be relevant. So this moving up to 2005 and 2004 is relevant to this particular case as to the organization.

You're correct in showing — saying that it doesn't prove anything about any one of these three guys directly yet. But it does show the organization that they're alleged to be part of was in operation and using many of the terms that I've already heard and may hear again from other witnesses.

MR. POTOLSKY: Judge, we understand that. I think our point is under Rule 403, even relevant evidence should be excluded if the probative value is substantially outweighed by the prejudice. We're not disputing that the Bloods are an organization. We're not disputing with this witness or any other witness.

The slight, if any, additional probative value of "murder every crip child alive" is substantially outweighed by the inflammatory nature of that statement. That statement doesn't make any fact in issue in this trial against Mr. Hankins more likely than without it.

And the Court, in admitting all the other graffiti, does have the discretion to exclude that one photo because of

the grounds that we've been arguing.

THE COURT: I appreciate the argument. The Court is going to use its discretion here and finds that it is more probative than prejudicial. And that the probative value in the government's showing this organization is part of their proof.

What I — you know, it's a complicated indictment. We're trying to do the instructions on that and we've got about several different ways. We got North Carolina law implicated, federal law implicated, South Carolina law implicated. It may take me two days to read the instructions in this case.

MR. SMITH: We would just preserve that objection, as well, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Absolutely, that objection. You all want to make it, too, Mr. Foster?

MR. FOSTER: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Foster, yes.

Certainly. I think it's very probative. But I have looked at this. I appreciate you all pointing out the Williams case. And I think that I see a very strong line that I can require the government to follow and take care of it in that way. So that's what I'm going to do.

You're going to use him as a fact witness and a fact witness only. I'm not going to allow opinions to come into

the case.

MR. POTOLSKY: Understood. Need we object again in front of the jury as to photograph B or Exhibit B?

THE COURT: No. No. That — no, your objections — but what I'm just saying is and we can't take — we're not going to be able to take a sidebar like this on every single objection. This one I'm glad it worked out this way. But I'm not going to send the jury out and — although it's quicker for us to go into the side room, I think it's counter-productive to have the defendants staring at the jury while we're out. I think that's counter-productive to what we — to this case.

So we're not going to be taking many sidebars out. So understand that you may have to state your reason for an objection on the record.

And I've been around long enough. If you can do it for a limited purpose that I understand. If you say, objection, you know, 403. I understand what you're objection is there. But you may have — something I don't understand you may just have to explain.

And if it's very — its highly prejudicial that I need to hear it outside the jury, we will take sidebars. But I'm not going to — this has interrupted this case for nearly an hour and — not unfairly, not wrongly. But if we did this all the way we would be trying this case till Christmas.

1 So anybody not understand where we are on this 2 witness? 3 MS. GREENE: I think we're - I think we're good, 4 Your Honor. 5 MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. 6 MS. GREENE: He can't say what anything means but he 7 can read things into the record or say what was done or what 8 he saw or what he did. 9 THE COURT: I'm going to let him - I'm going to 10 allow all those pictures that you've shown so far into 11 evidence. I'm going to allow the Facebook pictures into 12 evidence. If there's some that — subject to — if they have 13 an objection, a 403 objection, I'll consider that. 14 But generally he's competent to testify about all of 15 those things that are facts that he has seen as an 16 investigator and that can be hard facts. 17 The interpretation of it is going to have to be left 18 up to the jury or the people that are inside the organization. 19 They can testify about what that stuff means. They're living 20 it or not, as the case may be. 21 All right. Let's bring the jury in. 22 (The jury was returned to the court room at 10:54.) 23 THE COURT: Okay. The witness may be seated. 24 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Thank you for your patience, members of